

**Beaufort Sea Oil and Gas Lease
Sale 144**

Public Hearings

Anchorage

1995

1 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
2 MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
3 949 East 36th Avenue
4 Anchorage, Alaska 99503
5
6

7 OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

8 PUBLIC HEARING

9 BEAUFORT SEA SALE 144 DRAFT EIS
10
11

12 Fourth Floor Conference Room
13 Minerals Management Service
14 Anchorage, Alaska

15 Thursday, October 26, 1995
16 12:00 o'clock noon
17

18 MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE PANEL MEMBERS

19 Ms. Judy Gottlieb, Regional Director of the Alaska
20 Outer Continental Shelf Region

21 Mr. Rance Wall, Regional Supervisor for Resource
22 Evaluation

23 Mr. Jeff Walker, Special Assistant to the Regional
24 Director

25 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording. Transcript
produced by transcription service.

TABLE OF CONTENTS**PUBLIC TESTIMONY****PAGE**

Mr. Robert K. Bell	3
Mr. Carl Hilde	9

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA - THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1995

(On record at 12:00 noon)

COURT REPORTER: On record.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Welcome to the hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Federal Oil and Gas Lease Sale 144 in the Beaufort Sea. The area that's discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement is shown on the map behind me. Yes. Or we have a map showing the area.

My name is Judy Gottlieb. I'm the Regional Director of the Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Region. Other panel members include Rance Wall, Resource Evaluation Regional Supervisor and Jeff Walker, my Special Assistant. This is our first public hearing, and others will be held November 6 through 8 in Nuiqsut, Kaktovik, and Barrow, respectively.

If you would, as a testifier, please state your name and address and the organization or agency you represent. We may need for you to spell your name just to make sure we have it clearly. If you have any prepared testimony, please provide a copy for us to the Court Reporter. And we would like testifiers, of course, to come up to the microphone. Our Recorder is making a verbatim transcript. Everything that is spoken here while we are in session will be recorded, and if you would like a copy you may see Cindy about obtaining one.

The purpose of this hearing is to improve the quality

1 of the Environmental Impact Statement before it is put in final
2 form. Speakers will not necessarily be questioned unless one
3 of us has a need to have some facts clarified or obtain
4 additional information.

5 The comment period for this document closes November
6 20th. Until that time, we will accept written statements from
7 anyone who would prefer to make written rather than oral
8 comments. Those written comments and statements should be sent
9 to us at 949 East 36th Avenue, Anchorage 99508. Again, the
10 comment period ends on November 20th.

11 And so I think our first testifier, please come
12 forward.

13 (Pause)

14 PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. ROBERT K. BELL

15 Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Robert Bell.
16 I am Chairman of the Fisheries Joint Management Committee which
17 is a legislatedely based co-management body in Canada's Western
18 Arctic created as a result of the Inuvialuit final agreement
19 and the subsequent legislation that followed to settle a land
20 claim. I have a card here that I'll leave here with you.

21 MS. GOTTLIEB: Great.

22 BY MR. BELL (Resuming):

23 I first of all appreciate the opportunity to be able
24 to speak to you. I would -- what I would like to say is
25 largely on behalf of the Inuvialuit of the Western Arctic,

1 folks who live in the area directly east of the area under
2 consideration for the gas and oil lease sale.

3 Like the Inupiat of your North Slope, the Inuvialuit
4 have occupied the Yukon North Slope and the adjacent land and
5 islands in and around the Mackenzie Delta for thousands of
6 years. Like the folks on the Alaska North Slope, many
7 Inuvialuit choose to follow a subsistence lifestyle and are
8 therefore dependent upon wildlife, both marine and terrestrial,
9 for their well-being. It's therefore not surprising that when
10 they signed their own land claim agreement with the government
11 of Canada in 1984, that agreement contains some very strong
12 provisions to deal with the impacts of developments that were
13 anticipated for this settlement region, especially those
14 related to oil and gas.

15 The land claim established a two-tiered screening and
16 review process to consider all development activities and
17 assured the Inuvialuit that they would have equal represent- --
18 representation with government at both the initial screening
19 levels and the review processes. Thus, within the settlement
20 region, the Inuvialuit feel that they have the tools to protect
21 and give preference to their subsistence lifestyle.

22 While the Inuvialuit have every confidence that the
23 review process -- processes which are planned for the various
24 developmental activities that may be contemplated for the
25 Alaska North Slope will be every bit as rigorous and as

1 comprehensive as their own, they do wish to point out that this
2 particular impact statement pays scant attention to the fact
3 that many of the resources at risk are shared resources. That
4 is, they are hunted and harvested on both sides of the
5 Alaska/Canada border.

6 For some species, such as beluga and bowhead whales,
7 the coastal waters off the Alaska North Slope form a highway,
8 providing passage to and from wintering areas to the west and
9 south and summering areas in the Canadian Beaufort Sea.
10 Belugas whales, particularly, are important culturally and as a
11 food source in the settlement region.

12 The waters of the Beaufort Sea support a polar bear
13 population that is hunted extensively in both Canada and
14 Alaska. That it is a shared population is supported by
15 extensive scientific research. Acknowledging this fact,
16 wildlife biologists on both sides of the border jointly provide
17 management advice to the Alaska/Inuvialuit Polar Bear
18 Commission so that the population can be managed sustainably
19 for the benefit of both Inuvialuit and Alaskans. Yet this is
20 the population that will be put at risk when the oil spills
21 that the stats -- statisticians say are almost in- --
22 inevitable do occur.

23 This is also the case for large populations of other
24 subsistence resources, such as migratory waterfowl. These
25 resources may be more at risk even, since the lethal effects of

1 relatively small amounts of oil are well documented. Within
2 the area of potential impacts, such effects are likely to be
3 both acute and chronic as there exists the likelihood of severe
4 degradation of critical habitats such as staging and nesting
5 areas.

6 Many of the fish species that will be at risk as a
7 result of subsequent activities related to this EIS are
8 migratory in nature. Some of these are important in both areas
9 in a food chain sense, providing energy inputs for higher
10 levels in the system. Others, like corregonids, herring, and
11 arctic char are food fish and end up in the nets and on the
12 dinner tables on both sides of the border.

13 Now, the Inuvialuit are quite able to qualify and
14 quantify all of the above, should it be necessary. They have
15 been conducting a comprehensive harvest study for the past
16 eight years and know with accuracy the number of belugas whales
17 harvested, the number of polar bears taken from the shared
18 population, the volume of fish caught by species, by household,
19 and by community. It is interesting to note that one of the
20 reasons they decided to implement such a comprehensive and
21 expensive harvest study was to provide themselves with the
22 information necessary so that they could negotiate compensation
23 agreements with industry in Canada.

24 Panel, I don't want to take any more of your time.
25 However, I do want to assure you that the Inuvialuit feel that

1 they have a great deal at stake in this process and the likely
2 subsequent developments. They feel that because of the
3 potential negative impacts on their traditional and subsistence
4 way of life, their concerns must be taken into account in the
5 EIS process. They are prepared to contribute information and
6 knowledge to the extent that their resources allow. Thank you.

7 MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks. We certainly would like to
8 get information on those particular harvest studies. That
9 would be helpful to us. And I guess I also wondered, I'm sure
10 it is in the study, whether they take narwhals?

11 MR. BELL: No. Narwhals are very incidental in our
12 area.

13 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Thanks.

14 (Pause)

15 MR. BELL: I could leave a copy of this if it would
16 be helpful.

17 MS. GOTTLIEB: It would be great. We sure would like
18 a card and we'll.....

19 MR. BELL: Sure.

20 MS. GOTTLIEB: We can be in touch with you.....

21 MR. BELL: Sure.

22 MS. GOTTLIEB:about getting some of those
23 studies.

24 MR. BELL: Yes. And I'd just point out that as my
25 technology failed once more and I had to fax this to myself

1 to -- so that I could.....

2 MS. GOTTLIEB: We could make an extra copy.

3 MR. BELL: Yes, that would be.....

4 MS. GOTTLIEB: Yeah. And you're coming over to
5 Kaktovik as well?

6 MR. BELL: I won't be there. We -- the Game Council,
7 the Inuvialuit Game Council, which is the body that represents
8 the collective interests in renewable resources for the
9 Inuvialuit, are planning to have a delegate there. But you
10 have to recognize that the only way to get over is to charter
11 from Inuvialuit and its 10 or 15 thousand dollars to do it. So
12 it's a -- if they are able to make it, that's another signal of
13 their interests.

14 MS. GOTTLIEB: Right. Right.

15 MR. WALKER: Are your harvest studies specific to the
16 Canadian side, or is that inclusive of both sides of the
17 border?

18 MR. BELL: Just inside the settlement regions, or
19 just to the Alaska border.

20 MR. WALKER: Okay.

21 MS. GOTTLIEB: Carl, you're welcome to come up.

22 (Pause)

23 MR. HILDE: Going to have to smash my knees on the
24 table here.

25 (Laughter - Pause)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF MR. CARL HILDE

Okay. My name is Carl Hilde. I'm a biologist with the Indigenous Peoples Council for Marine Mammals, and I work at the Rural Alaska Community Action Program. I appreciate the opportunity to come in to this hearing. I double-checked my notice a couple different times, and I thought 12:00 o'clock noon was a strange time to start a hearing. I brought my lunch just 'cause I figured I might have to sit here for awhile, and I wasn't sure.

(Laughter)

But let me jump into my comments here; mine go pretty much through the order of the document. I haven't actually even gotten through the entire piece, and I will be submitting written comments here in the next month so that I can have a full set of comments. But there were some pieces here that I found quite disturbing.

As I looked at this document, I anticipate that this is based on other documents that have been written in the past and am surprised at some major components that I believe to be lacking from this document that needs to be considered in the final EIS that's prepared. So I'll get into this right now.

On page II, Roman Numeral II-4, there's a list of stipulations that need to be considered for the document, and one of those is No. 5, which is for the subsistence and bowhead whale activities. And I was very pleased to see that this was

1 specifically outlined in this document. But at the same time,
2 under No. 1 and No. 4 -- which I think I better just refer to
3 here. This is II-4. The point under the No. 1 portion is the
4 protection of biological resources. Point No. 4 is to modify
5 operations to ensure that significant biological populations or
6 habitats deserving protection are not adversely affected.

7 It's a nice general statement, and as I went further
8 through the document, I was impressed with the fact that there
9 wasn't a whole lot of substantiation. And someplace in this
10 document I really think it needs to be spelled out that the
11 Marine Mammal Protection Act has clearly stated what the
12 definition of "take" is. And I find, later, that definition.
13 But the concern here is that within the Marine Mammal
14 Protection Act, it states clearly that in order to have that
15 kind of incidental take, that if you anticipate that this is
16 going to happen, you have to have a permit to do so.

17 Several years ago the oil companies asked for a
18 blanket permit for polar bear issues from U.S. Fish and
19 Wildlife Service. And just this past year that was --
20 actually, about two years ago now, that was approved but with
21 the condition that within 18 months, a polar bear habitat
22 strategy needed to be completed. That has been done, and so
23 this is proceeding. However, if my memory serves me correctly,
24 and I will be verifying this, the limit for that particular
25 activity is from the border of the Arctic National Wildlife

1 Reserve heading west. So it's not inclusive of this lease sale
2 area.

3 So the question would be, What happens to the areas
4 north of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that is not
5 included in that incidental take permit for polar bears and
6 walrus? Likewise, that's just for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
7 Service. It does not include all of the other species mammal
8 species that are covered under the U.S. -- under the National
9 Marine Fisheries Service.

10 And as is specifically mentioned in here, bowheads --
11 you know, I think it's -- it's good throughout this whole
12 document. You have a section on bowhead whales. It is an
13 endangered species, so it needs to be specified.

14 Polar bears are talked about. However, information
15 on all of the other seals, I think, is relatively limited in
16 this. Walrus are mentioned, and they don't get into this lease
17 area to any great extent. But what I found absolutely shocking
18 is the fact that even though there's a reference to grey whale,
19 there's no other information in this document that deals at all
20 with grey whales, even though it's suggested -- and I'll set
21 out the specific rec- -- point where there's a conflict in the
22 document.

23 Now, I understand, from talking to the National
24 Marine Fisheries Service, that the oil companies have requested
25 a blanket permit for incidental non-lethal take nationally for

1 marine mammals, but that has not been approved to date. And so
2 until that is, this could be a huge hang-up for the oil and gas
3 lease sale as, throughout this document, it is mentioned that
4 there may be situations where there would be spills, where
5 there would be activity that would be disturbed, and that is
6 considered a take of these marine mammals, and so that an
7 incidental take permit would be required for any specific
8 activity.

9 So if it -- if they don't get a blanket permit for
10 these incidental takes they'd have to be looking at every
11 activity that was used for the development of this area would
12 have to be specifically permitted, and it would be quite a
13 process.

14 Also, that all of those permits must be coordinated
15 with the local subsistence users. So there is a process where
16 they -- the oil companies or whoever would be developing these
17 lease sales -- would have to verify that they have met with
18 local subsistence users and that there has been documentation
19 of those meetings.

20 I think that at least this should be mentioned in
21 this No. 1 point in this Item No. 4, that the Marine Mammal
22 Protection Act and its requirements for incidental take need to
23 be addressed. You don't have to go into a whole lot more
24 detail, but I certainly think since this is early in the
25 document, this is what -- one point where people are going to

1 be looking.

2 Therefore, Item No. 5 is not complete either, so
3 that, with the bowhead whale, you'd want to be also looking at
4 all of the other marine mammal species. It's not just the
5 bowhead whale. Yes, it's endangered, but Marine Mammal
6 Protection Act is for all the marine mammals, and therefore, it
7 needs to be covered.

8 Item No. 3 should be expanded due to the paucity of
9 data on all of the Arctic marine mammals, and that citation of
10 all animals during the bowhead monitoring program should be
11 made. The recommendation here would be that that would be
12 excha- -- possibly retitled to being Bowhead Whale and Marine
13 Mammal Monitoring Program. If you're going to be having crews
14 out there monitoring for bowhead whales, the documentation of
15 belugas and other marine mammals that are sighted during that
16 time period would be valuable. I know that's -- that it does
17 happen in those reports, but I think it should be specifically
18 mentioned.

19 MS. GOTTLIEB: Excuse me, Carl. I'm getting a little
20 confused when you're saying "Item 3" and.....

21 MR. HILDE: Okay. I'm.....

22 MS. GOTTLIEB:first I thought you meant the
23 stipulation, but I'm wrong on that.

24 MR. HILDE: Yeah. Yeah, it's stipulation.

25 MS. GOTTLIEB: Well.....

1 MR. HILDE: Stipulation.....

2 MS. GOTTLIEB: One, perhaps?

3 MR. HILDE: Okay. Where it is?

4 MS. GOTTLIEB: Protection of biological resources on
5 page II-4, I guess.....

6 MR. HILDE: Yeah.

7 MS. GOTTLIEB:or page V?

8 (Pause)

9 MR. HILDE: Yeah. It would be the Industry Site-
10 Specific Bowhead Monitoring Program. Like I said, it would be
11 No. 4, not No.3.

12 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. So I heard you say either -- I
13 mean, in that one or in the explanation of that one.

14 MR. HILDE: Right.

15 MS. GOTTLIEB: Talk about requirements for incidental
16 take.

17 MR. HILDE: Under the Protection of Biological
18 Species.....

19 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay.

20 MR. HILDE:Item No. 4, it says,
21 "Modify operations to ensure the significant
22 biological populations or habitats
23 deserving...."

24 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay.

25 MR. HILDE: That should be expanded.

1 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay.

2 MR. HILDE: In regards to all take issues and the
3 permits required.

4 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. 4, okay.

5 MR. HILDE: And then what I'm saying is, then, under
6 the Industry Site-Specific Bowhead Monitoring Program.....

7 MS. GOTTLIEB: Right.

8 MR. HILDE:that should be expanded to bowhead
9 whale as a primary focus, but also then include all of the
10 marine mammals.

11 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. I've got it.

12 MR. HILDE: Okay.

13 MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks.

14 MR. HILDE: I'm sorry. Okay.

15 BY MR. HILDE (Resuming):

16 The next item that I wanted to mention -- and I
17 started flipping through this because I started looking at the
18 maps, and I became concerned because last spring, President
19 Clinton went to a meeting in Ottawa, Canada, to discuss a
20 number of issues, and one of the things that was on the topic
21 of discussion was the development of the Arctic Council.

22 The U.S. has opposed the Arctic Council for a number
23 of years now, the basic philosophy, but agreed to enter into
24 discussions if Canada would enter into discussions in regards
25 to disputed boundary between the U.S. and Canada starting at

1 Demarcation Point. Canada has claimed for a long time that
2 they claimed the area from Demarcation Point up 141 to the
3 North Pole.

4 This lease sale extends into that area. I don't
5 think this should proceed any further until there's some
6 clarity on what's going to happen in that area. So if there's
7 to be a recommendation, Alternative 2 is no lease sale, or
8 Alternative 3, that the Barter Island is deferred would be two
9 ways to address this until that boundary dispute is clarified.

10 And I really think that it would be unfair to all the
11 people bidding to move forward on that particular component of
12 this lease sale until that boundary dispute is clarified and
13 that both nations agree to exactly to whose territory we're
14 talking about in that corner. And that was something I did not
15 see anywhere in the document that -- as far as I've gotten, but
16 I think it should be addressed since this is something that the
17 State Department is currently investigating.

18 On page III-B.7., I would recommend that your staff,
19 if they have not seen them, get the -- this is September '95,
20 so you may not have seen these yet. This is the Alaska Marine
21 Mammal Stock Assessment Reports from the National Marine
22 Fisheries Service, as well as the stock assessment reports both
23 for Pacific walrus and for the Chukchi and Bering Sea stocks of
24 polar bears. You can see these are October 4, '95, so they've
25 been out for less than a month. So clearly, these were not

1 available when the draft was prepared, but they should be now
2 considered for the next round of this, to include the most
3 recent data.

4 The other piece here. I do have a problem with the
5 spelling of beluga. The correct common spelling is b-e-l-u-
6 g-a, and the spelling that is used throughout this document is
7 a white sturgeon from Russia. I don't think it's appropriate.
8 I'm sorry.

9 (Laughter)

10 So I would recommend that since the National Marine Fisheries
11 Service has beluga spelled one way, that we be consistent, at
12 least on a national basis.

13 Page III-B.7. mentions grey whale as being described
14 below, but it's not. Grey whales are not described anywhere in
15 this document that I have found. And that's a major error. We
16 spent millions of dollars, the oil companies spent millions of
17 dollars trying to rescue three of these silly critters a few
18 years ago, and yet they're not even mentioned anywhere in this
19 lease sale document. And that's a major, major error.

20 Page III-C.9., No. 3, Subsistence Harvest Patterns.
21 I would again refer back to the SRAs, the stock assessment
22 reports. They do provide the latest information on harvest
23 numbers.

24 As we get further into the document -- I'm now going
25 to shift gears. I have a fascination with thermodynamic

1 issues, and under Section IV-A.28., we start talking about
2 pipelines that are going to be put under the Arctic Ocean. And
3 yet there is no mention in any of the documents that I have
4 seen to date that talks about biotic changes, changes of the
5 local surrounding marine ecosystem when you start raising it a
6 couple of temperatures by putting a heated pipe in the ground.

7 There's also been no mention of melting of the sea
8 permafrost. There is a mention that it's more likely because
9 the sea permafrost, being in the saltwater environment, is less
10 frozen, or less cold, than the permafrost on shore, so that if
11 you do put a heated pipe in the ground, no matter how well it's
12 insulated, you increase the chance of having some thermo-
13 erosion under water. Also, there's no mention about having a
14 heated source below active ice, particularly the one that
15 parallels the coast, not the one that's perpendicular to the
16 coast. And this might actually weaken the ice and cause a lead
17 system to be established that has not been there in the past.

18 So I would suggest that there be some information
19 here about the heat loss gradient in water, undersea gravel,
20 on-shore gravel, and elevated pipes, whether they're under
21 water or on shore. I think this idea of having extensive pipes
22 carrying hot oil under Arctic ice is an area that has not been
23 discussed in this EIS.

24 As has been mentioned, I think, at hearings about a
25 lot of oil development throughout the state, is the clean-up

1 capability of under-ice pipeline leaks. The viability of those
2 technologies is stated in here as not being that great, nor in
3 broken ice or in rough sea conditions. And think this is
4 something that needs to be considered if this area is to be
5 developed, that those technologies have to be tested in real
6 world conditions. And until that's done, considering the
7 statistics, you know, we would be looking at a spill here
8 someplace in the future and no potential for really having the
9 technology to clean up.

10 Page IV, Roman Number IV-A.21., any spill -- because
11 it does talk in this section about the possibilities of a
12 spill -- any spill will be a take under the MMPA, even if a
13 single seal is affected, which is quite likely considering some
14 of the statistics given in this document. So this needs to be
15 mentioned. And this gets back to this idea of a blanket
16 permit, which does not exists at this point, so that the way
17 this document currently reads, in my mind, is that the
18 likelihood of a spill is pretty great considering the large
19 habitat used by a variety of marine mammals. You're talking
20 about a set-up where any activity would require a permit for an
21 incidental take. That should be anticipated.

22 Again, under IV-B., starting on page XXVI, there's a
23 Section No. 5, which talks about all of the other marine
24 mammals, but no grey whales are listed. And they should be
25 under Section 5, not 6, because under Section 6, there's only

1 endangered species, and grey whales have been taken off the
2 grey whale listing at this point. So grey whales should be
3 incorporated some place in the IV-B., page XXVI.

4 I mentioned about the spills, and I think that that's
5 going to be self -- something that has to be dealt with in
6 regards to this issue of take. IV-C.1., I was surprised; this
7 is the no action section of the document, that if nothing is
8 done with this sale, what would the impact be. I think it was
9 pretty poor just to summarize this in two pages. I think there
10 needs to be some comment about the socioeconomic impacts to the
11 local communities, North Slope Borough, and the State.

12 If nothing happens there, we continue as is, but what
13 possible impact that might be -- 'cause the- -- some of these
14 communities, I think, are basing their future on continued
15 development in the Arctic. And if suddenly this is not
16 available to them for any consideration, it's going to have
17 more ramification than just no mention in this particular
18 section.

19 Page IV-E.2. and other similar areas, again, I think
20 need to address the lower trophic level organisms. This is in
21 regards to the thermo impact of the heated pipe. And I'll
22 mention -- but it -- it's throughout this document, there are
23 numerous places where they talk about this lower trophic level,
24 and there's been no mention of what happens when you put a hot
25 pipe in the bottom of the Arctic Ocean. I think that you will

1 see some significant change there because of the thermo-balance
2 of a lot of those organisms.

3 IV-G.21., habitat alternation should be modified to
4 also consider not only the spills but the thermo-pipeline
5 impact in the ocean -- undersea impacts.

6 IV-H.1. concludes that there will be incidental take
7 of marine mammals. This is illegal for companies to do this
8 unless they have a permit to take, for incidental take. And
9 that should be spelled out, that if you anticipate there will
10 be spills and that there will be high likelihood of marine
11 mammal impact, then these companies have to have these
12 incidental take permits.

13 Thank you. I will be preparing this as a written
14 document and submitting it later.

15 MS. GOTTLIEB: Great. Thanks Carl. As usual, very
16 thoughtful comments. Hope you can stay a little bit.

17 MR. HILDE: Yeah.

18 MS. GOTTLIEB: There's some things that we probably
19 can talk about that the hearing forum isn't exactly -- but we
20 have.....

21 MR. HILDE: Fine.

22 MS. GOTTLIEB:some ideas to exchange with you.
23 Thank you.

24 MR. HILDE: Thank you.

25 MS. GOTTLIEB: Sandra, if you'd would like to come up

1 and.....

2 SANDRA: Oh, I don't -- did I sign in for comments?

3 MS. GOTTLIEB: I thought possibly.

4 SANDRA: Oh, no, I didn't have any really.

5 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Okay.

6 SANDRA: I was just interested in the information.

7 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Well, I believe then that's all
8 our formal testifiers at this point. We'll go off the record,
9 and maybe we can talk a little bit.

10 And Sandra, did you have some questions for us?

11 SANDRA: No. I hadn't seen a copy of the document,
12 and I just read it in the paper, and I was mostly interested
13 to.....

14 (Laughter)

15 COURT REPORTER: Off record.

16 (Off record at 12:30 p.m.)

17 (On record at 2:50 p.m.)

18 COURT REPORTER: On record. The time is 2:50 p.m.

19 (Side comments)

20 COURT REPORTER: I took your words.

21 MS. GOTTLIEB: Very good. Having no further people
22 signing up to testify, we'll close the public hearing.

23 COURT REPORTER: The time is 2:51 p.m. The
24 proceedings are now adjourned.

25 / / /

1 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-entitled
2 matter were adjourned at 2:51 p.m.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

STATE OF ALASKA)
THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT) ss.
_____)

I, CINDY S. CARL, do hereby certify:

(1) That the foregoing pages contain a full, true, and correct transcript of proceedings in the above-entitled matter, transcribed by me, or at my direction and supervision, to the best of my knowledge and ability.

(2) That I have been certified for transcript services by the United States Courts.

(3) That I was certified for transcript services by the Alaska Court System prior to January 1, 1993.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED:

BY: Cindy S. Carl
Cindy S. Carl
Certified Court Reporter

DATE: 12/8/95

